

Appl. No. 09/943,821  
Amdt. dated April 21, 2004  
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2004

### REMARKS

With regard to the requirement for election and restriction, which is the only point raised in the Official Action mailed on March 22, 2004, the Applicants hereby provisionally elect, with traverse, the Group I claims, namely, Claims 1-9, for examination.

However, it is believed that the Group II claims, Claims 10-17, are so closely related to the Group I claims that it should remain in the same application in order to preserve unity of invention.

The different classifications of the Group I and II claims have been noted, but it is felt that these classifications are not necessarily conclusive on the question of restriction and election. It is believed that the Examiner is trying to draw too fine a line of distinction and that when all the facts are taken into account, the Group II claims should remain in this application. Furthermore, a search of one Group would necessitate a search for the other, and therefore, it would be efficient to search both groups together.

In any event, to facilitate the prosecution of this case, Applicants elect Group I, Claims 1-9, with traverse and reserve the right to file a divisional application to the non-elected Group II claims.

It is believed that an action on the merits is in order and such is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2004

By: Edward F. Sherer  
Edward F. Sherer  
Attorney for Applicant  
Attorney Registration No. 29,588

ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology Department  
P. O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522  
(281) 834-5933  
Fax: (281) 834-2495